arXiv:1703.09325v1 [math.FA] 27 Mar 2017

A dual form of the sharp Nash inequality and its weighted generalization

Eric A. Carlen[1] and Elliott H. Lieb[2]

[1] Department of Mathematics, Hill Center,

Rutgers University, 110 Frelinghuysen Road Piscataway NJ 08854-8019 USA

[2] Departments of Mathematics and Physics, Jadwin Hall, Princeton University

Washington Rd., Princeton, NJ 08544.

March 27, 2017

Abstract

The well known duality between the Sobolev inequality and the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality suggests that the Nash inequality should also have an interesting dual form. We provide one here. This dual inequality relates the L^2 norm to the infimal convolution of the L^∞ and H^{-1} norms. The computation of this infimal convolution is a minimization problem, which we solve explicitly, thus providing a new proof of the sharp Nash inequality itself. This proof, via duality, also yields the sharp form of some weighted generalizations of the Nash inequality and the dual of these weighted variants.

Key Words: duality, Nash inequality, infimal convolution.

1 Introduction

Our focus is on a dual form of the Nash inequality for functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that bounds the infimal convolution of the L^∞ norm and the squared H^{-1} norm in terms of the L^2 norm as follows:

$$L_n \|g\|_2^{\frac{2n+4}{n+4}} \geq \inf_{h \in L^{2n/(n+2}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(g-h)\|_2^2 + \|h\|_\infty \right\} . \tag{1.1}$$

[1]Work partially supported by U.S. National Science Foundation grant DMS 1501007.

[2]Work partially supported by U.S. National Science Foundation grant PHY 1265118

© 2017 by the authors. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

The sharp constant L_n is specified below in Theorem 2.1. (See the remarks at the beginning of Section 2 on the meaning of $\|(-\Delta)^{1/2}f\|_2$ in dimensions 1 and 2.)

The Nash inequality is one member of the family of inequalities known as the *Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev* (GNS) *inequalities* [6, 11]: For all $1 \leq p < q \leq 2n/(n-2)$ ($1 \leq p < q < \infty$ for $n = 1, 2$), there is a finite constant C such that for all locally integrable functions u on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a distributional gradient that is a square integrable function,

$$\|u\|_q \leq C\|u\|_p^{1-\theta}\|\nabla u\|_2^{\theta} \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{\theta(n-2)}{2n} + \frac{1-\theta}{p}\,, \tag{1.3}$$

and $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the L^p norm with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. (A more general version, not discussed here, allows for the consideration of $\|\nabla u\|_r$ for $r \neq 2$.) For $n \geq 3$ and $q = 2n/(n-2)$, in which case (1.3) gives $\theta = 1$, (1.2) reduces to the *Sobolev inequality*

$$\|u\|_{2n/(n-2)}^2 \leq S_n\|\nabla u\|_2^2\,, \tag{1.4}$$

for which the sharp constant S_n was determined by Aubin and Talenti [1, 13]. There are only a few other cases of (1.2) in which the sharp constant is known: One is that in which $p = r + 1$ and $q = 2r$ for some $r > 0$, This family of sharp inequalities is due to Del Pino and Dolbeault [3] The other family of sharp constants is for the Nash inequality [10], in which $p = 1$ and $q = 2$, and hence $\theta = n/(n+2)$. The sharp constants in this case were found by Carlen and Loss [2]. It is well known that the sharp Sobolev inequality (1.4) is equivalent, by duality, to the sharp *Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev* (HLS) *inequality* [9, Thm 8.3], and that this equivalence extends to a more general form of the Sobolev inequality: For all $n \geq 2$ and all $0 < \alpha < n/2$, there is a constant $C_{n,\alpha}$ so that

$$\|u\|_{2n/(n-2\alpha)}^2 \leq C_{n,\alpha}\|(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\|_2^2\,, \tag{1.5}$$

which reduces to (1.2) for $\theta = 1$ when $\alpha = 1$. For all (real) $v \in L^{2n/(n+2\alpha)}$, and all (real) $u \in L^{2n/(n-2\alpha)}$, (1.4) is equivalent to

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} vu\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{2n/(n-2\alpha)}^2 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} vu\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}C_{n,\alpha}\|(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\|_2^2\,.$$

Taking the supremum over u, which amounts to computing the Legendre transforms (see Rockafellar [12]) of the proper lower semicontinuous convex functionals on both sides of (1.4), one obtains

$$\|v\|_{2n/(n+2\alpha)}^2 \geq C_{n,\alpha}^{-1}\|(-\Delta)^{-\alpha/2}v\|_2^2\,, \tag{1.6}$$

with the same constant $C_{n,\alpha}$.

Since the Legendre transform is involutive for proper lower semicontinuous convex functionals, the argument is reversible, so that (1.5) and (1.6) are equivalent, and there is even a one-to-one correspondence between cases of equality in these two inequalities.

This duality is useful: The sharp form of (1.6) was first obtained by Lieb [8], and then, by this duality, the sharp form of (1.5) follows immediately. It is natural that the sharp form of (1.5) was first obtained in this manner because the functional $u \mapsto \|(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\|_2$ is *not* monotone decreasing under spherically symmetric decreasing rearrangement for $\alpha > 1$, but monotonicity under rearrangement is valid in HLS inequality (1.6) for all $0 < \alpha < n/2$, Thus, the dual relation between (1.5) and (1.6) means that extremals of (1.5) must be translates of symmetric decreasing functions despite the non-monotonicity of $u \mapsto \|(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\|_2$ under rearrangement.

It is natural, therefore, to ask what are the dual forms of the various GNS inequalities with $\theta < 1$. Our focus is on the Nash inequality, corresponding to $q = 2$ and $p = 1$, and consideration of the dual form (see equation (1.1)) leads us to new sharp forms of certain weighted Nash inequalities (see equation (5.3) and Theorem 5.1 below).

To put matters in context, however, we first discuss the duality in greater generality. There are several ways to obtain equivalent dual forms of GNS inequalities. The first step is to produce an equivalent form of (1.2) in which the right side is a a convex function of u, and already at this point there are choices to be made. One way to do this is to use the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality to deduce

$$\|u\|_q^2 \leq (1-\theta)C^{2/(1-\theta)}\|u\|_p^2 + \theta\|\nabla u\|_2^2 \ . \tag{1.7}$$

since the two terms on the right side of (1.7) scale as different powers of λ when $u(x)$ is replaced by $u(\lambda x)$, one readily recovers (1.2) from (1.7).

A second way is to introduce the functional $\Phi_p(u)$ given by

$$\Phi_p(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \|u\|_p \leq 1 \\ \infty & \|u\|_p > 1 \ . \end{cases} \ . \tag{1.8}$$

Then (1.2) is also equivalent to the inequality

$$\|u\|_q^{2/\theta} \leq C^{2/\theta}\|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \Phi_p(u) \ . \tag{1.9}$$

While (1.2) and (1.9) are equivalent, the latter is less symmetric than the former. If for $\mu, \lambda > 0$, $u(x)$ is replaced by $\mu u(\lambda x)$ in (1.2), then both sides scale linearly in μ and with the same power of λ. However, only when one replaces $u(x)$ by $\lambda^{n/p}u(\lambda x)$ in (1.9) do both sides scale with the same power of λ. Likewise, the form (1.7) is homogenous of degree 2, but it has no scale invariance. The crucial advantage of (1.7) and (1.9), though, is the convexity of the right side.

Both (1.7) and (1.9) have the general form

$$\mathcal{F}(u) \leq \mathcal{E}_1(u) + \mathcal{E}_2(u) \tag{1.10}$$

where $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are proper lower semicontinuous convex functionals on a Banach space X. Now let Y be another Banach space, and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be bilinear form on $X \times Y$ making them a dual pair of Banach spaces. For example, we might have $X = L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Y = L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the usual pairing.

For any $v \in Y$, $\langle u, v\rangle - \mathcal{F}(u) \geq \langle u, v\rangle - (\mathcal{E}_1(u) + \mathcal{E}_2(u))$. Taking the supremum over $u \in X$ yields

$$\mathcal{F}^*(v) \geq (\mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*)(v) \ , \tag{1.11}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^*$, $\mathcal{E}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{E}_2^*$ are the Legendre transforms of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ respectively, and $\mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*$ is the *infimal convolution* of $\mathcal{E}_1^*$ and $\mathcal{E}_2^*$ [12]:

$$(\mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*)(v) = \inf_{v_1} \{\mathcal{E}_1^*(v - v_1) + \mathcal{E}_2^*(v_1)\} \tag{1.12}$$

The inequality (1.11) is likely to be much less useful, or even intelligible, than (1.10) unless one can explicitly compute a closed form of the infimal convolution on the right side of (1.11), or at least show that a minimizing v_1 exists in (1.12), and provide a characterization of this minimizing v_1.

In order to do this for GNS inequalities, it is often useful to make a judicious change of variable and choice of the dual pair $(X, Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$. For example, consider the case in which $p = 2$. Let $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be non-negative, and let $\rho(x) = u^2(x)$, so that ρ is a density; i.e., a non-negative integrable function. Note that

$$\|\nabla u\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho} \mathrm{d}x =: \frac{1}{4} I(\rho) \ . \tag{1.13}$$

The function $I(\rho)$, often called the *Fisher Information* when ρ is a probability density, is evidently convex in ρ. Thus (1.9) may be rewritten as

$$\|\rho\|_{q/2}^{1/\theta} \leq \frac{C^{2/\theta}}{4} I(\rho) + \Phi_1(\rho) \ . \tag{1.14}$$

Take $X = L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $Y = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the usual dual pairing. Then for $V \in L^\infty$, since $I(\rho)$ is homogeneous of degree one,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\rho \in L^1, \rho \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} V(x)\rho(x)\mathrm{d}x - \frac{C^{2/\theta}}{4} I(\rho) + \Phi_1(\rho) \\ = & \sup_{\rho \in L^1, \rho \geq 0} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} V(x)\rho(x)\mathrm{d}x - \frac{C^{2/\theta}}{4} I(\rho) \ : \ \|\rho\|_1 = 1 \right\} \\ = & \sup_{u \in L^2} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} V(x)u^2(x)\mathrm{d}x - C^{2/\theta} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \ : \ \|u\|_2 = 1 \right\} = \lambda_1(V) \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_1(V)$ is the largest eigenvalue of the operator $C^{2/\theta}\Delta + V$. Therefore, the dual form of (1.9) with $p = 2$, which is equivalent to the $p = 2$ case of (1.2), gives a sharp bound on $\lambda_1(V)$ in terms of $\|V\|_{q/(q-2)}$. The duality was essential in the proof of stability bounds for this inequality given by Carlen, Frank and Lieb [4].

Therefore, if we define $\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) = \dfrac{C^{2/\theta}}{4} I(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(\rho) = \Phi_1(\rho)$ where $I(\rho)$ is the Fisher information defined in (1.13) and Φ_1 is defined in (1.8), the calculation made just above says that

$$\mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*(V) = \lambda_1(V) \ , \tag{1.15}$$

which in this case identifies the infimal convolution in (1.11) as a functional of interest.

One can do something similar for $1 < p < 2$. In this case, for $u \in L^p$, $u \geq 0$, define $\rho = u^p$. Then

$$\|u\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{p^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{|\nabla \rho|^2}{\rho^{(p-1)(2/p)}} \mathrm{d}x$$

which is again convex in ρ, but it is not homogeneous of degree one, and no familiar functional emerges from the infimal convolution.

Before turning to the case $p = 1$, $q = 2$ of (1.2), which is the Nash inequality, consider the other way, given in (1.7), of writing (1.2) in the form (1.10). Then

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \|u\|_q^2 \ , \quad \mathcal{E}_1(u) = (1-\theta) C^{2/(1-\theta)} \|u\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_2(u) = \theta \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \ .$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}_1(u) + \mathcal{E}_2(u) = \langle u, [-\theta\Delta + (1-\theta) C^{2/(1-\theta)} \mathbf{1}] u \rangle_{L^2} \ .$$

In this case, we may take $X = Y = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the usual pairing, the dual inequality is

$$\|v\|_{q'}^2 \geq \langle v, [-\theta\Delta + (1-\theta) C^{2/(1-\theta)} \mathbf{1}]^{-1} v \rangle \ ,$$

and thus the norm of the operator $[-\theta\Delta + (1-\theta) C^{2/(1-\theta)} \mathbf{1}]^{-1}$ from $L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $1/q + 1/q' = 1$, is exactly one. (This gives an alternate characterization of the best constant in the family of GNS inequalities (1.2) when $p = 2$.

2 A dual form of the Nash inequality

We now turn to the case $p = 1$, $q = 2$ of (1.2) so that $\theta = n/(n+2)$. This case of (1.2) is often written as

$$\|f\|_2^{2+\frac{4}{n}} \leq C_n \|\nabla f\|_2^2 \|f\|_1^{\frac{4}{n}} \ . \tag{2.1}$$

We take the equivalent form (1.9) as the starting point for our computation of a dual form. In computing the dual form, we shall have to compute

$$\sup_{f \in X} \langle g, f \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f\|_2^2 \tag{2.2}$$

for $g \in Y$ with an appropriate choice of the dual pair $(X, Y, \langle \cdot, \rangle)$. The supremum in (2.2), taken over $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, defines the the H^{-1} norm [7] of a locally integrable function g:

$$\frac{1}{2}\|g\|_{H^{-1}}^2 = \sup_{f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} gf \mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla f\|_2^2 \ .$$

In dimensions 1 and 2, when g is integrable, $\|g\|_{H^{-1}} = \infty$ unless $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g \mathrm{d}x = 0$. To see this for $n = 1$, take $R > 0$, and $f_R(x) = \sqrt{R/2}$ for $|x| < R$, $f_R(x) = \sqrt{R/2}(1 - |x|/R)$ for $R \le |x| \le 2R$ and $f(x) = 0$ for $|x| > R$. Then for all R, $\|\nabla f_R\|_2 = 1$, while

$$\lim_{\mathbb{R}\to\infty} \sqrt{\frac{2}{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g f_R \mathrm{d}x = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \mathrm{d}x \ .$$

Thus $\|g\|_{H^{-1}} = \infty$. A similar argument may be made for $n = 2$ taking f_R to be a multiple of $1 - |\log(|x|/R)|^\alpha$, $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, for $R \le |x| \le eR$.

If we take $X = Y = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the usual dual pairing, then the supremum in (2.2) is $\frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} g\|_2^2$, where in dimension $n \ge 2$, $(-\Delta)^{-1/2} g$ is a multiple of $\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |x - y|^{1-n} g(y) \mathrm{d}y$. We use the notation $\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} g\|_2$ for the H^{-1} norm in all dimensions.

In the variational calculations that follow, it is necessary to have the identity $\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} g\|_2^2 = \langle g, (-\Delta)^{-1} g \rangle$. The Green's function for the Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is $G_n(x, y) = K_n |x - y|^{2-n}$ for $n \neq 2$, and is $G_2(x, y) = K_n \log(|x - y|)$ for constants K_n depending only on n. Therefore, we must choose the dual pair $(X, Y, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ so that for all x, $G_n(x, y) g(y)$ is integrable in y. By the HLS inequality, for $n \ge 3$, we may take $Y = L^{2n/(n+2)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $X = L^{2n/(n-2)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the usual dual pairing.

For $n = 1$, there is no singularity in $G_1(x, y)$ at $y = x$, but instead there is linear growth as $|x - y| \to \infty$. Therefore we let μ_1 denote the weighted measure $\mathrm{d}\mu_1(x) = (1 + |x|)\mathrm{d}x$, and take $Y = L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mu_1)$. With the standard dual pairing, we may take X to consist of all measurable functions f such that $\operatorname{esssup}\{|f(x)|/(1 + |x|)\} < \infty$. For $n = 2$, $G_2(x, y)$ has both a logarithmic singularity at $x = y$ and logarithmic growth as $|x - y| \to \infty$. Let μ_2 denote the weighted measure $\mathrm{d}\mu_2(x) = \log(e + |x|^2)\mathrm{d}x$, and let Y denote the Orlicz space $L \log L(\mathbb{R}^2, \mu_2)$, and let X be its standard dual. Summarizing,

$$Y = \begin{cases} L^{2n/(n+2)}(\mathbb{R}^n) & n \ge 3 \\ L \log L(\mathbb{R}^2, \mu_2) & n = 2 \\ L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mu_1) & n = 1 \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\mu_1(x) = (1 + |x|)\mathrm{d}x$ and $\mathrm{d}\mu_2(x) = \log(e + |x|^2)\mathrm{d}x$

Then for all $g \in Y$,

$$\varphi_g(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G_n(x, y) g(y) \mathrm{d}y \tag{2.4}$$

is well-defined and continuous; we refer to φ_g as the *potential of* g.

With the dual pairs chosen, we define convex functionals on X as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(f) = \frac{1}{2} C_n^{-1} \|f\|_2^{2+\frac{4}{n}} , \qquad \mathcal{E}_1(f) = \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla f\|_2^2 , \quad \mathcal{E}_2(f) = \begin{cases} 0 & \|f\|_1 \leq 1 \\ \infty & \|f\|_1 > 1 . \end{cases} . \tag{2.5}$$

(The functionals are defined to be $+\infty$ when the integrals defining the norms in their definition are infinite.) We may then rewrite (2.1) as

$$\mathcal{F}(f) \leq \mathcal{E}_1(f) + \mathcal{E}_2(f) . \tag{2.6}$$

Upon computing the Legendre transforms, the equivalent dual form of the Nash inequality is

$$\mathcal{F}^*(g) \geq \mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*(g) . \tag{2.7}$$

By direct computation, $\mathcal{F}^*(g) = L_n \|g\|_2^{\frac{2n+4}{n+4}}$, where L_n is a constant that may be evaluated in terms of C_n, but see (2.8) below.

By our choice of the dual pairs, we have that $\mathcal{E}_1^*(g) = \frac{1}{2}\langle g, (-\Delta)^{-1} g\rangle_{L^2}$, and $\mathcal{E}_2^*(g) = \|g\|_\infty$. Thus we obtain the following **dual version of the Nash inequality:**

2.1 THEOREM. *For all $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,* (1.1) *is valid with*

$$L_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_1} \|\widehat{g}\|_2^2 + \langle \widehat{g} \rangle \right) \|\widehat{g}\|_2^{-2(n+2)/(n+4)}, \tag{2.8}$$

and where $\mu_1 > 0$ is the principal eigenvalue of the (negative) Neumann Laplacian on the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. and $\widehat{g}$ is the positive radial monotone decreasing function supported on B, specified as follows.

(1) $\widehat{g} - \langle \widehat{g} \rangle$ is the principal eigenfunction of the Neumann Laplacian on B.

(2) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (-\Delta)^{-1} (\widehat{g} - \langle \widehat{g} \rangle) dx = 1$.

A non-negative function g satisfies (1.1) *with equality if and only if, for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda > 0$*

$$g(x) = \lambda^{n+2} \widehat{g}(\lambda x). \tag{2.9}$$

Theorem 2.1 is proved in Section 4., which provides further information on the optimizers.

The first step is to prove the existence and uniqueness of an optimizing h on the right side of (1.1). It will be convenient to split this optimization into two steps: For $c > 0$, define

$$A_g(c) = \inf_{h \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2} (g - h)\|_2^2 \ : \ \|h\|_\infty \leq c \right\} \tag{2.10}$$

Then (1.1) can be written as

$$L_n \|g\|_2^{\frac{2n+4}{n+4}} \geq \inf_{c>0} \{ c + A_g(c) \} . \tag{2.11}$$

The right side of (2.11) is the infimal convolution functional that we study in the next section, with the goal of rendering this functional more explicit by showing that an optimal h in (2.10) and c in (2.11) exist, and by giving a reasonably explicit determination of them in terms of g. Our main results are contained in Theorems 3.2 and Theorem 3.8 The information provided by Theorem 3.8 on the optimizing h is explicit enough that it is the basis of a direct determination of the sharp constant L_n and all of the optimizers for (2.10), and, hence, *for the original Nash inequality!* We also obtain a new weighted generalization, proved in Theorem 5.1.

2.2 Remark. The scale invariance of the inequality (1.1) will be useful later on. Let $\lambda > 0$ be a scaling parameter and, given $f \in Y$, define

$$f_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{n+2} f(\lambda x) \ . \tag{2.12}$$

One readily checks that

$$|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(f_\lambda - h_\lambda)\|_2^2 = \lambda^{n+2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(f-h)\|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|h_\lambda\|_\infty = \lambda^{n+2}\|h\|_\infty \ ,$$

so that the two terms in the infimal convolution scale with the same power of λ. Another simple computation shows that

$$\left(\|g_\lambda\|_2^2\right)^{(n+2)/(n+4)} = \lambda^{n+2}\left(\|g\|_2^2\right)^{(n+2)/(n+4)} \ .$$

Therefore, if g is an optimizer for (1.1), and if, for this g, there exists an optimal h in the infimal convolution in (1.1), then for all $\lambda > 0$, g_λ is an optimizer for (1.1) and h_λ is an optimizer in the corresponding infimal convolution, in accordance with the final statement in Theorem 2.1.

We close this section by giving a direct proof of (1.1) with a sub-optimal constant, and introducing some notation that will be used in the sequel. Part of this proof will be useful in the next section when we show that an optimizing h and c exist. We give the details for $n \geq 2$; the adaptation to $n = 1$ is left to the reader.

By the HLS inequality, $\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(|g| - c)_+\|_2^2 \leq C_{n,1}\|(|g| - c)_+\|_{2n/(n+2)}^2$. To estimate the right side in terms of $\|g\|_2^2$ and c, note that for any $c > 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|g| - c)_+^{2n/(n+2)} \mathrm{d}x \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |g|^{2n/(n+2)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|g| \geq c\}} \mathrm{d}x \leq S\|g\|_2^{n/(n+2)} \left(|\{|g| \geq c\}|\right)^{2/(n+2)} \ , \tag{2.13}$$

where $|\{|g| \geq c\}|$ denote the measure of the set $\{x \ : |g|(x) \geq c\}$. By Chebychev's inequality, $|\{|g| \geq c\}| \leq \|g\|_2^2 c^{-2}$, and hence

$$\|(|g| - c)_+\|_{2n/(n+2)}^2 \leq \left(\|g\|_2^2\right)^{\frac{n+2}{n}} c^{-4/n} \ .$$

For the set on which $|g| \geq c$ we take $h = c\,\mathrm{sgn}\,(g)$. For the set on which $|g| < c$ we can take $h = g$, whence $g - h = 0$. Altogether, with this choice of h, $A_g(c) \leq C_{n,1}(\|g\|_2^2)^{\frac{n+2}{n}} c^{-4/n}$. and consequently,

$$\inf_{c>0}\left\{c + A_g(c)\ \right\} \leq \inf_{c>0}\left\{c + C_{n,1}\|g\|_2^{n+2} c^{-4/n}\ \right\} = K_n \|g\|_2^{\frac{2n+4}{n+4}}$$

for an explicitly computable constant K_n depending only on n and $C_{n,1}$. For $n = 1, 2$, the contruction must be modified to ensure that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(g-h)\mathrm{d}x = 0$; this is easly done. By duality, this gives a proof of the Nash inequality via the HLS inequality, but not with the sharp constant. The results of the next section provide more information.

3 Optimizers for the infimal convolution

Our goal in this section is to show the existence of optimizers h *for a fixed* g in the variational problem

$$\inf_{h\in Y}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(g-h)\|_2^2 + \|h\|_\infty\right\} . \tag{3.1}$$

and determine their form as explicitly as possible. Our main results are Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.8.

3.1 LEMMA. *Let $g \in Y$, with Y defined in (2.3), let $c \in (0,\infty)$, and let $A_g(c)$ be defined as in (2.10). Then there exists a unique $L^{2n/(n+2)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ function h satisfying $\|h\|_\infty \le c$ and*

$$A_g(c) = \frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(g-h)\|_2^2 .$$

Proof. Fix $g \in Y$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ denote the set of functions $f \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $h := g - f$ satisfies $\|h\|_\infty \le c$. This set $\mathcal{K}$ is non-empty since, for $n \ge 3$, it contains $f := g - \max\{\min\{g(x), c\}, -c\}$. For $n = 1, 2$, a small modification is needed to ensure that $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^n} f\mathrm{d}x = 0$, and that $f \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$: One may increase the size of the set on which $|h| = c$.

The set $\mathcal{K}$ is evidently convex. To see that it is closed in $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let ρ be a positive, compactly supported C^∞ function with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\rho\mathrm{d}x = 1$. Then $(-\Delta)\rho(x) \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (with $\|(-\Delta)\rho\|_{H^{-1}} = \|\nabla\rho\|_2$). Let $\{f_n\}$ be any convergent sequence in $\mathcal{K}$ with limit $f \in H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho(x)[g(x)-f_n(x)]x = \langle(-\Delta)\rho, g-f_n\rangle_{H^{-1}} \to \langle(-\Delta)\rho, g-f\rangle_{H^{-1}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho(x)[g(x)-f(x)]x .$$

It follows that, with $h = g - f$ and $h_n = g - f_n$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho h\mathrm{d}x = \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\rho h_n\mathrm{d}x \le c$ Since this is true for all such ρ, $\|h\|_\infty \le c$. Since $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a Hilbert space, the *projection lemma* [9, Lemma 2.8], says that the closed, non-empty convex set $\mathcal{K}$ contains a unique element $f = g - h$ of minimal norm. □

3.2 THEOREM. *Let $g \in Y$, with Y defined in (2.3), let $c \in (0,\infty)$, and let $A_g(c)$ be defined as in (2.10), and let h be the optimizer in (2.10). Then:*

(1) For $n \geq 3$, $\varphi(x) := (-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h)(x) = 0$ for all x such that $|h(x)| < c$. For $n = 1, 2$, φ is constant on this set.

(2) On the set $\{x \ : |h(x)| < c\}$, $h(x) = g(x)$. Furthermore $g - h$ is integrable and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(g-h)\mathrm{d}x = 0$.

Under the further assumption that g is non-negative,

(3) The function h is non-negative, and on the set $\{x \ : g(x) \geq c\}$, $h(x) = c$.

Proof. For $\tilde{h} \in Y$, define $\mathcal{G}(\tilde{h}) = \frac{1}{2}\langle g - \tilde{h}\,,\, (-\Delta)^{-1}g - \tilde{h}\rangle_{L^2}$. Then

$$\varphi(x) = (-\Delta)^{-1}(h-g)(x) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{G}}{\delta h}(x)\ ,$$

the first variation of $\mathcal{G}$ at $\tilde{h} = h$. On the set $\{x \ \ |h(x)| < c\}$, the first variation must vanish for $n \geq 3$. If $n = 1.2$ the only allowed variations δh in h are those with $\mathrm{R}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta h \mathrm{d}x = 0$. In this case we conclude that φ is constant on the set $\{x \ |h(x)| < c\}$. This proves *(1)*.

By part *(1)* and the 'No Flat-Spots' Theorem of Frank and Lieb [5] $\Delta\varphi = 0$ on the set $\{x \ : \ \varphi(x) = 0\}$. This implies that $g = h$ on this set, which by *(1)*, includes the set $\{x \ |h(x)| < c\}$. Since $h \in L^{2n/(n+2)}$, the set $\{x \ |h(x)| = c\}$ has finite measure, and thus $g - h$ is integrable. If the integral were not zero, it would be impossible for φ to vanish outside a set of finite measure. This proves *(2)*.

For the rest, suppose that $g \geq 0$, and relax the variational problem for $A_g(c)$: Minimize the functional $\mathcal{G}$ over all h satisfying only $h(x) \leq c$, and not $|h(x)| \leq c$.

On the set where the minimizing h satisfies $h(x) < c$, it must be the case that $\varphi(x) = 0$, and then as before, $h = g$ on this set. Since $g \geq 0$, it is possible that h takes on negative values. Thus $h \geq 0$, the the constraint $h \leq c$ has the same force as the constraint $|h| \leq c$. Since on the set $\{x \ : g(x) \geq c\}$, $h = g$ is impossible, it must be that $h(x) = \pm c$ for almost every x in this set. Since h is non-negative, this proves *(3)*. □

3.3 Remark. If g takes on both signs, the optimizing h *need not* satisfy $h = c$ on $\{g \geq c\}$ and $h = -c$ on $\{g \leq -c\}$, because the potential φ is depends on the values of g and h in a non-local manner. For example, consider $0 < c < 1$, and

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & |x| > 1 \\ -a, & 1 \geq |x| > 1/2 \\ 1, & 1/2 \geq |x| \end{cases}$$

where a is a large positive number. Then the potential φ_g will be non-positive everywhere, which means that $h(x) = c$ where $c < |g(x)|$, which is on the entire support of g.

We now turn to the determination of the optimal c in (2.11). For any $c \geq 0$, let $\varphi_{(c)}$ denote the potential $\varphi_{(c)} = (-\Delta)^{-1}(g - h_c)$.

3.4 LEMMA. *For all $g \in Y$, $A_g(c)$ is a strictly convex function of c on the interval $(0, \|g\|_\infty)$. Moreover, the map $c \mapsto \varphi_{(c)}$ is continuous into $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on $(0, \|g\|_\infty)$.*

Proof. Let $0 < c_0 < c_1 < \|g\|_\infty$, and let $\lambda \in (0,1)$. Define $c_\lambda = (1-\lambda)c_0 + \lambda c_1$. For all $c \in (0, \|g\|_\infty)$, let h_c denote the optimizing h in the variational problem defining $A_g(c)$. Since $|h_{c_1}| = c_1$ on the set where $|g| > c_1$, while $\|h_{c_0}\|_\infty = c_0 < c_1$, $h_{c_0} \neq h_{c_1}$.

Note that

$$\|(1-\lambda)h_{c_0} + \lambda h_{c_1}\|_\infty \leq (1-\lambda)c_0 + \lambda c_1 = c_\lambda \ ,$$

and, therefore, by the strict convexity of $h \mapsto \langle g - h, (-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h)\rangle$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_g(c_\lambda) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\langle g - [(1-\lambda)h_{c_0} + \lambda h_{c_1}]\,,\, (-\Delta)^{-1}(g - [(1-\lambda)h_{c_0} + \lambda h_{c_1}])\rangle_{L^2} \\ &< (1-\lambda)\frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_{c_0}\,,\,(-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h_{c_0})\rangle_{L^2} + \lambda\frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_{c_1}\,,\,(-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h_{c_1})\rangle_{L^2} \\ &= (1-\lambda)A_g(c_0) + \lambda A_g(c_1) \ . \end{aligned}$$

Next, by the parallelogram law in the Hilbert space $H^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and by the convexity proved above,

$$\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(h_{c_0} - h_{c_1})\|_2^2 \leq A_g(c_0) + A_g(c_1) - A_g(c_{1/2}) \ .$$

Since A_g is convex, it is continuous, and, as c_1 and c_0 approach each other, $\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(h_{c_0} - h_{c_1})\|_2^2$ tends to zero. This implies that $c \mapsto (-\Delta)^{-1/2}h_c$ is continuous into L^2, and then, for $n \geq 3$, by the HLS inequality, $c \mapsto \varphi_{(c)}$ is continuous into $L^{2n/(n-2)}$. Since for any $0 < c < c_0$, $\varphi_{(c_0)} - \varphi_{(c_1)}$ vanishes outside the set on which $h_c = c$, and since this set has finite measure, the continuity into $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ follows from the continuity into $L^{2n/(n-2)}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. □

The strict convexity proved in Lemma 3.4 shows that there is a unique minimizing c in (2.11). To obtain an equation for this minimizing c, we proceed under the assumption that $g \geq 0$.

Define $E_c := \{x \ : \ \varphi_{(c)}(x) > 0\}$ and define $F_c = \{x \ : \ h_c(x) = c\}$. On the set E_c, $h_c = c$ since, otherwise, one could lower the value of the functional defining $A_g(c)$ by increasing h. By the optimality of h_c, $\varphi_c = 0$ on the complement of F_c. That is, $E_c = F_c$, which shows that F_c is open.

Note that for $c_0 < c_1$, $\varphi_{c_1} \leq \varphi_{c_1}$ and $E_{c_1} \subset E_{c_2}$. By Lemma 3.4, the function $c \mapsto A_g(c)$ has left and right derivatives at each $c \in (0, \|g\|_\infty)$.

3.5 LEMMA. *For all $0 < c < \|g\|_\infty$,*

$$\lim_{s\downarrow 0} \frac{A_g(c) - A_g(c-s)}{s} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c)} \mathrm{d}x \leq \lim_{s\downarrow 0} \frac{A_g(c+s) - A_g(c)}{s} \ . \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Let $0 < c < \|g\|_\infty$ and let $s > 0$ be small enough so that $c + s < \|g\|_\infty$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A_g(c+s) - A_g(c) &= \frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_{c+s}, \varphi_{(c+s)}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_c, \varphi_{(c)}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\langle h_c - h_{c+s}, \varphi_{(c+s)}\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_c, \varphi_{(c+s)} - \varphi_{(c)}\rangle \ . \end{aligned}$$

By what has been explained above, $h_c - h_{c+s} = -s$ on the set where $\varphi_{(c+s)}$ is non-zero, Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g - h_c, \varphi_{(c+s)} - \varphi_{(c)}\rangle &= \langle \varphi_{(c)}, h_c - h_{c+s}\rangle \\ &= \langle \varphi_{(c+s)}, h_c - h_{c+s}\rangle + \|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(h_c - h_{c+s})\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Altogether,

$$A_g(c+s) - A_g(c) = -s\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{c+s}\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(h_c - h_{c+s})\|_2^2 \ . \tag{3.3}$$

Similar computations show that for $s > 0$ and $c - s > 0$,

$$A_g(c) - A_g(c-s) = -s\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_c\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(h_c - h_{c+s})\|_2^2 \ . \tag{3.4}$$

Now (3.2) follows from the monotonicity of φ_c. □

3.6 Remark. Lemma 3.5 shows that if A_g is differentiable at c, then $A_g'(c) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_c\mathrm{d}x$; by the convexity proved in Lemma 3.4, A_g is differentiable almost everywhere. Moreover, by the second part of Lemma 3.4, $c \mapsto -\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_c\mathrm{d}x$ is continuous.

We now turn to the minimization problem in (2.11):

3.7 LEMMA. *For $g \in Y$, $g \geq 0$, here exists a unique $c_0 \in (0, \|g\|_\infty)$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c)}\mathrm{d}x = 1 \ , \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$c_0 + A_g(c_0) < c + A_g(c)$$

for all $c \neq c_0$ in $(0, \|g\|_\infty)$.

Proof. ince $g \geq 0$, $\lim_{c\to 0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c)}\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_g(y)\mathrm{d}y = \infty$. It is also clear that $\lim_{c\to\|g\|_\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c)}\mathrm{d}x = 0$. Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 show that the function $c \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c)}\mathrm{d}x$ is continuous and strictly monotone. It follows that there exists a unique $c_0 \in (0, \|g\|_\infty)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{(c_0)}\mathrm{d}x = 1 \ . \tag{3.6}$$

Then by Lemma 3.6, the left derivative of $c + A_g(c)$ is non-positive at $c = c_0$, while the right derivative is non-negative. It follows that in this case c_0 minimizes $c + A_g(c)$. □

In summary, we have proved the following:

3.8 THEOREM. *Let $g \in Y$, $g \geq 0$. Then there is a unique $h \in Y$ such that for all $\widetilde{h} \in Y$, $\widetilde{h} \neq h$,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(g-h)\|_2^2 + \|h\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2}\|(-\Delta)^{-1/2}(g-\widetilde{h})\|_2^2 + \|\widetilde{h}\|_\infty \ .$$

Moreover:

(1) $h \geq 0$ and $g - h$ is integrable with $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(g-h)\mathrm{d}x = 0$.

(2)On the set $\{x \ : \ h(x) \neq \|h\|_\infty$, $h(x) = g$. and $\varphi_{g-h}(x) = 0$.

(3) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi_{g-h}\mathrm{d}x = 1$.

3.1 The case in which g is radially symmetric and monotone

Now consider the case in which g is non-negative, radially symmetric and monotone; i.e., the case in which $g = g^*$, its radially symmetric decreasing rearrangement. In this case, Theorem 3.8 gives us an explicit description of the optimizing h. For some $c \leq \|g\|_\infty$, $h = h_c$ where

$$h_c(x) = \begin{cases} c & |x| \leq r(c) \\ g(x) & |x| > r(c) \ , \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

and where $r(c)$ is uniquely determined (for fixed c) by the requirement that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (g - h_c)\mathrm{d}x = 0 \ ,$$

and then c itself is fixed by the requirement that

$$\int_{|x|\leq r(c)} \int_{|y|\leq r(c)} G_n(x,y)(g(y)-c)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x = 1 \ .$$

4 Proof of Theorem 2.1 concerning the dual Nash inequality

In the previous sections we have determined the optimal h for a given function g. We are now ready to determine the optimizers g for the dual Nash inequality (2.11) that will determine the sharp constant L_n in (1.1).

By duality there is a one to one correspondence between optimizers for the Nash inequality and its dual. Moreover, the functional gradient of a power of the L^2 norm evaluated at f is a multiple of f. Therefore, every optimizer for the dual Nash inequality is a multiple of the Nash inequality and *vice-versa*. By the Faber-Krahn inequality, the Nash inequality has symmetric decreasing optimizers, and hence so

does the dual Nash inequality. Once we have characterized the symmetric decreasing optimizers for either inequality, a standard argument, recalled below, that relies on the cases of equality in the Faber-Krahn inequality, shows that all optimizers are symmetric decreasing. Consequently we are allowed to restrict attention to symmetric decreasing functions in our search for optimizers of the dual inequality. We emphasize that our proof of the sharp dual form of the Nash inequality is completely independent of the the proof of the sharp Nash inequality [2]; all we need to know is that minimizers of the Nash inequality are necessarily symmetric decreasing.

The first thing to do is show that an optimizer exists, either for the Nash inequality or its dual. The existence for the Nash inequality is a special case of a well known result for the full family of GNS inequalities (1.2). For a simple proof in the case $p = 2$ see [4, Lemma 4.2]. This proof is easily adapted to $p = 1$, $q = 2$, which is the Nash inequality. We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Suppose that g is a symmetric decreasing optimizer. Let h_g be the corresponding optimizer in (3.1). The support of h_g is a closed ball $\overline{B(r)}$ of some radius $r > 0$. Then $g(x)$ must vanish for $|x| > r$ since any non-zero values of g in the region $|x| > r$ contribute on the left side of (2.11), but not on the right side. This shows that the optimizers are compactly supported.

Since $g \in Y$ and has compact support, $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Taking the first variation of $L_n(\|g\|_2^2)^{(n+2)/(n+4)}$ at the optimizer g, we obtain a Cg for some constant C depending on $\|g\|_2$ and n. In computing the variation of the infimal convolution, we use the fact that a minimizing h_g exists so that the infimal convolution (3.1) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2}\langle g - h_g, (-\Delta)^{-1}(g - h_g)\rangle - \|h_g\| \ .$$

By the optimality of h_g there is no contribution from the variation of h_g as g is varied, and so the variation of the infimal convolution at g is $\varphi_g = (-\Delta)^{-1}(g - h_g)$. It follows that

$$Cg = (-\Delta)^{-1}(g - h_g) \ .$$

Taking the Laplacian of both sides,

$$C(-\Delta)g = g - h_g \ . \tag{4.1}$$

Unless the radial derivative of g vanishes on the boundary of the ball supporting φ_g (and hence g), there is a non-zero measure concentrated on the boundary of this ball included in $(-\Delta)g$. Since there is no such measure on the right side of (4.2), g satisfies *Neumann (as well as Dirichlet) boundary conditions* on $B(r)$. Let

$$\langle g\rangle = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g\mathrm{d}x}{|B(r)|} \ .$$

The function h_g is very simple in this case. It equals the constant $\langle g\rangle$ times the indicator function of the ball $B(r)$. Thus, letting Δ_N be the Neumann Laplacian on $B(r)$,

$$(-\Delta_N)(g-\langle g\rangle) = \frac{1}{C}(g-\langle g\rangle)\ . \tag{4.2}$$

That is, $(g-\langle g\rangle)$ (and not g itself) is a radial eigenfunction of the Neumann Laplacian Δ_N on $B(r)$, and g is radial decreasing. This is only possible if $g-\langle g\rangle$ is the radial eigenfunction of $-\Delta_N$ with the least strictly positive eigenvalue, $\mu_1(r)$, and, in this case, $C = 1/\mu_1(r)$.

Our conclusion is that if g is an optimizer supported in $\overline{B(r)}$ then $g-\langle g\rangle$ must be a multiple of this Neumann eigenfunction.

Unlike the case for the direct Nash inequality, which is homogeneous, there is no simple scaling now and thus, for each ball with given radius, there is exactly one optimizer supported in that ball.

Let ψ_1 be the first non-constant radial eigenfunction of $-\Delta_N$ on $B(r)$ that satisfies $\psi_1(0) = 1$. This is a Bessel function [2]. For any $a > 0$, define $c = -a\psi_1(x)$ for $|x| = r$, and define $g = a\psi_1 + c$. Then g is radially symmetric and monotone decreasing, and $\langle g\rangle = c$. Thus, $g-\langle g\rangle = a\psi_1$, and for $x \in B(r)$,

$$-\Delta g = (-\Delta_N)(g-\langle g\rangle) = \mu_1(r)a\psi_1 = \mu_1(r)(g-\langle g\rangle)\ ,$$

for all x, $-\Delta g = \mu_1(r)(g - h_{\langle g\rangle})$, which is the same as

$$(-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h_{\langle g\rangle}) = \frac{1}{\mu_1(r)}g\ .$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}(-\Delta)^{-1}(g-h_{\langle g\rangle})\mathrm{d}x = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g = \frac{1}{\mu_1(r)}|B(r)|\langle g\rangle\ . \tag{4.3}$$

There is a unique value of a such that the right side of (5.4) equals 1. For this value of a, h_g is the optimal h for g in the infimal convolution, and

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{h\in Y}\left\{\frac{1}{2}\langle g-h\,,\,(-\Delta)^{-1}g-h\rangle_{L^2} + \|h\|_\infty\right\} &= \frac{1}{2}\langle g-h_{\langle g\rangle}\,,\,(-\Delta)^{-1}g-h_{\langle g\rangle}\rangle_{L^2} + \|h_{\langle}g\rangle\|_\infty \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\mu_1(r)}\|g-\langle g\rangle\|^2_{L^2(B(r))}\rangle_{L^2} + \langle g\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\mu_1(r)}\|g\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\langle g\rangle\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is valid since the quantity on the right side of (5.4) equals 1. This function g is then the unique optimizer of the dual Nash inequality supported in $\overline{B(r)}$, and the sharp constant L_n in (1.1) is given by (2.8). By the remarks on scale invariance, this is independent of r, as it must be.

□

5 Weighted Nash inequalities

The method of Section3 can be used to compute a more general class of infimal convolutions. Let $w(x)$ be a strictly positive function on R^n. Let $\mathcal{E}_1^*(g) = \frac{1}{2}\langle g, -\Delta^{-1} g\rangle$ and let $E_2^*(g) = \|g/w\|_\infty$. Then

$$\mathcal{E}_1^* \square \mathcal{E}_2^*(g) = \inf_{h \in Y} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\langle g - h\,,\, (-\Delta)^{-1} g - h\rangle_{L^2} + \|h/w\|_\infty \right\} . \tag{5.1}$$

When g is nonnegative a unique optimal h exists, and the other theorems of Sections 3 and 3.1 apply as well. In particular, *when g is symmetric decreasing and w is symmetric increasing the minimizing h equals a constant times w inside a centered ball B of some radius r and equals g outside that ball.* The radius and the constant are determined by the condition that $\int_B h = \int_B g$.

When $w(x) = |x|^p$, with $p > 0$, the method of Section 4 can be applied to determine the constant in the sharp inequality

$$L_{n,p}\|g\|_2^{2\beta} \geq \inf_{h \in Y} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\langle g - h\,,\, (-\Delta)^{-1} g - h\rangle_{L^2} + \| \, |x|^{-p} h\|_\infty \right\} . \tag{5.2}$$

For $p = 0$ this reduces to the dual Nash inequality. Otherwise, we can call this the **dual weighted Nash inequality**.

By the arguments of Section 2 this is equivalent to the following **sharp weighted Nash inequality**:

$$\|f\|^{2+\gamma} \leq C_{n,p} \|\nabla f\|_2^2 \| \, |x|^p f\|_1^\gamma . \tag{5.3}$$

This inequality is homogeneous of order $2 + \gamma$ in f and scales correctly for $\gamma = n/(4 + 2p)$

As in Section 4, since the right side of (5.3) is monotone under symmetric decreasing rearrangement, if (5.2) has an optimizer g then it has a symmetric decreasing optimizer g. To keep this section short we pass over the proof that an optimizer exists, and leave it to the reader. (The argument in [4, Lemma 4.2] can be adapted to this end.)

Assume g is a symmetric decreasing optimizer for (5.2). Then it satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.2), in which h_g is the optimizer in the weighted infimal convolution. (Since h_g is a minimizer, we do not have to be concerned about the variation of h_g with respect to g.)

As before, let φ be the potential of $g - h_g$ and let $\overline{B(r)}$ be the closed ball that supports φ. By scale invariance we shall assume that $r = 1$ and just write B. Then, by (4.2), $\overline{B}$ also supports g Since g is an optimizer, g has the same support as φ, i.e., $\overline{B}$. This implies that h_g equals a constant multiple α of $w = |x|^p$ inside the ball and is zero outside. The constant α is fixed by the condition that h_g and g have the same integrals. Consequently, $h_g = (\langle g\rangle / \langle |x^p|\rangle)\, |x|^p \mathbb{1}_B$. By substituting this into (4.2), we

find that g must satisfy the homogeneous equation

$$Cg = (-\Delta)^{-1}\left(g - \langle g\rangle \frac{|x|^p}{\langle |x^p|\rangle}\mathbb{1}_B\right) \;=\; \varphi\ . \tag{5.4}$$

A slight variation from Section 4 is that the optimality of h_g yields the following condition on the optimizer, which breaks the homogeneity:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi(x)\,|x|^p\,dx = 1\ . \tag{5.5}$$

Among all the solutions of (5.4) only one of them will satisfy (5.5). This is the optimizer supported by B; scaling provides the rest.

The solution of the linear equation (5.4), subject to the linear constraint (5.5), is left to the reader. When p is an even integer, however, (5.4) can be cast as an eigenvalue problem, as in the unweighted case, except that the boundary conditions is Robin instead of Neumann. We explain how this is done when $p = 2$, from which the reader will easily perceive the solution to the $p = 2k$ case.

Apply the Laplacian to both sides of (5.4) and obtain

$$-\Delta g = \frac{1}{C}\left(g - \langle g\rangle \frac{|x|^2}{\langle |x^2|\rangle}\mathbb{1}_B\right). \tag{5.6}$$

Next, with $\alpha := \langle g\rangle/\langle |x^2|\rangle$, add

$$\Delta\left(\alpha|x|^2 - C2n\alpha\right) = 2n\alpha$$

to both sides of (5.6) and obtain, with $f := g - \alpha\left(|x|^2 - C2n\right)$,

$$-\Delta f = \frac{1}{C} f. \tag{5.7}$$

This equation holds everywhere in the unit ball B. As in Section 4, g satisfies both Dirichlet and Neumann boundary conditions on the boundary of B. Therefore, on the boundary of B, the ratio of the normal derivative of f to the value of f is given by $\rho := 2/(1 - 2nC)$, independent of g. This a Robin boundary condition. We conclude that the optimizer g is such that f is an eigenfunction of the Laplacian on the unit ball with this Robin boundary condition, and that $1/C$ is the eigenvalue.

Since g is symmetric decreasing, the only possibility for f is that it, too, must be decreasing (because f equals g plus the symmetric decreasing function $\alpha\left(C2n - |x|^2\right)$).

It remains to clarify the consistency condition between the number ρ and the number C, which appears twice. Thus, with $\mu(\rho)$ defined to be the fundamental eigenvalue of $-\Delta_R$ with the ρ Robin boundary condition, the consistency condition is

$$\mu\left(\frac{2}{1 - 2nC}\right) = \frac{1}{C}\ . \tag{5.8}$$

This equation picks out a unique C, and determines f, and g, up to a multiple. The multiple is fixed by (5.5).

As an example, consider $n = 3$. Then $f(x) = |x|^{-1}\sin(\lambda|x|)$ and $1/C = \lambda^2$. (In dimensions other than 3, this function will be replaced by a spherical Bessel function.) The ρ Robin boundary condition is satisfied with $\rho = \lambda\cot\lambda - 1$. The consistency condition (5.9) becomes

$$\lambda^2 = \frac{1}{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda\cot\lambda - 1 = \frac{1}{1-6C} \ . \tag{5.9}$$

Therefore $\lambda\cot\lambda = (6-2\lambda^2)/(6-\lambda^2)$, and this has a single solution $\lambda_0 = 1.60412258...$ in the interval $(0, \sqrt{6})$. Then if we define $\rho_0 = 2/(1-6\lambda_0^2)$, and let f be the fundamental ρ_0-Robin eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ on the unit ball B, and then define g on B by $g = f + \alpha(|x|^2 - 6\lambda_0^2)$, where α is chosen so that g vanishes at the boundary of B, and define 0 on the complement of B, g is the an optimizer for the weighted Nash inequality (5.3). Having found the optimizer, the determination of the constant is reduced to quadrature. The structure of the optimizers for (5.3) is analogous to the of the optimizers for the original Nash inequality found in [2]: They are sums of a multiple of the weight (constant for the original Nash inequality) and an eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in a ball, except now with Robin boundary conditions in place of Neumann boundary conditions.

To handle the $n-$dimensional case, define $J(r)$ to be the solution to $J''(r) + \frac{n-1}{r}J'(r) = -J(r)$ with $J(0) = 1$ and $J'(0) = 0$. (This function can be expressed in terms of Bessel functions.) The $n-$dimensional version of (5.9), after the elimination of C, is

$$\frac{\lambda J'(\lambda)}{J(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2 - 2n} \ . \tag{5.10}$$

Let λ_0 denote the least non-zero solution of (5.10) and then define

$$\rho_0 = \frac{\lambda_0^2}{\lambda_0^2 - 2n} \ . \tag{5.11}$$

We thus arrive at the following result:

5.1 THEOREM (Optimizers for the weighted Nash inequality)**.** *Let f be the principal (radial) eigenfunction of $-\Delta$ in the unit ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the ρ_0-Robin boundary condition, and with ρ_0 defined in* (5.11)*. Normalize f so that $f(|x| = 1) = 2/\rho_0$. Then the function*

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) - (|x|^2 - 1 + 2/\rho_0) & x \in B \\ 0 & x \notin B \end{cases}$$

is an optimizer for the weighted Nash inequality (5.3)*. Every optimizer has the form $cg(\lambda x)$ with $\lambda > 0$.*

A similar argument holds for $|x|^{2k}$, for any k. One adds the function $\Delta\left(\sum_{j=0}^{k}, \alpha_j|x|^{2j}\right)$, with suitable constants α_j, to both sides of the analog of (5.6).

References

[1] T. Aubin, *Problemes isopérimétriques et espaces de Sobolev.* Journal of differential geometry **11**, No. 4 (1976), pp. 573-598.

[2] E. A. Carlen and M. Loss *Sharp constant in Nash's inequality*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, **1993**, (1993) , pp. 213-215

[3] M. Del Pino and J. Dolbeault, *Best constants for Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and applications to nonlinear diffusions*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 81 (2002), pp. 847–875.

[4] E. A. Carlen,R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, *Stability estimates for the lowest eigenvalue of a Schrödinger operator*, G.A.F.A. **24**, (2014) pp. 63-84.

[5] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb, *A 'liquid-solid' phase transition in a simple model for swarming, based on the 'no flat-spots' theorem for subharmonic functions*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.07971.

[6] E. Gagliardo, *Proprietà di alcune classi di funzioni in più variabili* (Italian), Ricerche Mat. **7** 1958 102–137.

[7] P. D. Lax, *On Cauchys problem for hyperbolic equations and the differentiability of solutions of elliptic equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **8** 1955, 615–633.

[8] E. H. Lieb, *Sharp constants in the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and related inequalities*, Ann. Math. (2), 118 (1983), pp. 349–374.

[9] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss *Analysis, Second Ed*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 14, A.M.S., Providence R.I., 2011

[10] J. F. Nash *Continuity of solutions of parabolic and elliptic equations*, Amer. J. Math., **80**, (1958), PP. 931-954.

[11] L. Nirenberg, *On elliptic partial differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3) **13** (1959) pp. 115-162.

[12] Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1970

[13] G. Talenti, *Best constants in Sobolev Inequality.* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **110** (1976), pp. 353-372.